

Date: Mon, 12 Jul 93 11:38:53 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #223
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Mon, 12 Jul 93 Volume 93 : Issue 223

Today's Topics:

 Brilliant postings
Dana's generalizations (was Re: Lost petition for VHF/UHF beams) (2 msgs)
 Give a VE \$5.60, walk
 Give a VE \$5.60, walk out with a ham license... (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Mon, 12 Jul 1993 12:56:39 GMT
From: swrinde!gatech!hubcap!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Brilliant postings
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <21pgi2INNaua@emx.cc.utexas.edu> oo7@emx.cc.utexas.edu (Derek Wills)
writes:

>gary@ke4zv.uucp (Gary Coffman KE4ZV) proclaims:

>

>>>Morse remains in use by a few amateurs at HF

>

> A few? Well, lessee, there's a guy over in El Paso who uses
>it, and I hear tell that there are a couple of 'em in Dallas too.
>Mebbe even some old feller over Houston way.

>

> How can I take the rest of your postings seriously when you say
>stuff like this? A few?? You don't listen in the CW bands very much,
>do you? That is your choice, but just because I don't like phone
>operation very much I wouldn't say that "a few amateurs" use phone.

Manual Morse is now very much a specialty mode. During the debate leading up to the No Code license, I posed the question to a meeting of a local general interest ham club. I asked everyone who had made an amateur contact in the last 24 hours to stand. About 100 people stood, nearly everyone present. I then asked that only those who'd made an HF contact remain standing. The number dropped to about 30. Then I asked that only those who had used Morse for the contact remain standing. There were 3 people left standing. That meets my definition of "few". Note that all these people were coded licensees. Things may be even more lopsided today, or not. I'm sure I'd have gotten different proportions if I'd asked the question at the Southeastern DXers meeting, or at a packet LAN meeting. My admittedly unscientific band survey of 20 meters a couple of months ago showed 12% of the signals present were using Morse encoding.

Try doing a survey of *your* club at the next meeting.

Gary

--

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--------------|--|--------------------------|
| Gary Coffman KE4ZV | | You make it, | | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary |
| Destructive Testing Systems | | we break it. | | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary |
| 534 Shannon Way | | Guaranteed! | | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary |
| Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | | | | |

Date: Mon, 12 Jul 1993 03:49:39 GMT
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!
europa.eng.gtefsd.com!eddie.mit.edu!news.mtholyoke.edu!news.unomaha.edu!
cwis.unomaha.edu!ncc2001@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Dana's generalizations (was Re: Lost petition for VHF/UHF beams)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

As a follow-up to my previous post, my wife wishes to say that until this years Field Day, all she thought all hams were "nerdy" types. But after she worked some 10 meter voice at the Bellevue (NE) ARC novice shack, she wishes to get her no-code and will someday learn code when she has the time. She wishes to add that the "coolest" person she met there was a 15 year old Extra.

'nuff said

--

| | | | |
|------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| Michael Fortner | * | "I've got all this love to give and | |
| N0??? (7 weeks and counting) | * | so far all I have is my ham radio" | |
| ncc2001@cwis.unomaha.edu | * | -Selma Bouvier | |

Date: Mon, 12 Jul 1993 03:27:04 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
europa.eng.gtefsd.com!eddie.mit.edu!news.mtholyoke.edu!news.unomaha.edu!
cwis.unomaha.edu!ncc2001@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Dana's generalizations (was Re: Lost petition for VHF/UHF beams)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

mike@vatican.cdp.org writes:

> (Stuff Deleted)
>
> Lets take cancer. Over several months, you have a variety of symptoms.
> Sore throat, raspy voice, cough. None of them particular serious symptoms.
> But then, you visit the doctor. BING! Throat cancer, you have 3 months
> to live.
>
> I see the same thing happening to amateur radio. Slowly, its been turned
> into another 11 meters.
>
> (More Stuff Deleted)
>
> Next we were blessed with the wonderful no-code license. In *THIS* area
> (see if you can understand that, Dana) I would say that 90% of the no-codes
> are CB-transplants. 10-4. I'll be on the side. You have yourself a super-fine
> one. I gotta back on outta here. Basically, they became hams because when
> they unkeyed their mobile CB radio, it didn't go "bleep". Of course, there are
> some really good no-codes. However, most of them already upgraded.

Excuse me, but I am waiting for my no-code and I am not a CBer. I did 4 years in the Air Force as an Electronic Warfare Systems Technician. I have tried before to learn code, but have had a lot of trouble with it. Not all of us out here are blessed with the ear for morse code and/or the time to study the code. That does not make us second class operators. We can and often do contribute to the hobby. In fact, if it was not for the no-code license, your precious bands, cw and phone, would be quickly gobbled up by commercial interests citing a lack of interest in amateur radio to justify the use for just a few operators.

> Of course, let's not forget re-writing the Novice/Tech question pools so
> a 14-year-old can understand them. (Hell, that's DISCRIMINATION! There are
> 5 year old hams! Why not re-write the pools for a 5-year-old reading
> comprehension level?)

So, what is wrong with getting more young people into the hobby? If more teens and pre-teens start being hams, it could take a way the social view of an amateur radio operator as some socially-phobic techno-geek. It seems

to me that what you are afraid of is there being more people getting their license and stop the hobby from appearing as (and in some areas, being) an old-boys club.

> Ooops, can't forget that lovely "elimination of the station location"
> information on the 610. Hell, why should the FCC need that info? After
> all, its not like they're actually going to USE it and find some jammers
> now, is it? Nah, besides, its too much typing for the data entry clerks.

Now on this subject I agree with you. What the FCC needs is the funds and the teeth to enforce the laws concerning the use of the radio spectrum. Of course, our new president is concerned with spending our tax dollars making the lives of those who wish for the state to support them easier.

> Now, we have the elimination of the two-general Novice exam, and now the
> concept of "instant callsigns" on the table. Just wonderful. And I won't
> even get into the special "club" callsign fiasco which was designed simply
> to allow the ARRL to administer.

I've been waiting for over 7 weeks for my callsign. I called the FCC at (717) 337-1511 and found out that the waiting time for my area (0) is 6 to 8 weeks for amateurs, but only 2 to 3 weeks for commercial interests. So much for all men being equal. You are only equal when you are willing to assert your rights to be treated fairly. Hams across the country need to let their elected representatives in Washington, D.C. know that they are tired of being treated as second-class citizens by the FCC.

> If you can't see it people, you're blind. The ARRL has systematically
> attempted, and has managed to succeed, to increase its power base and
> monopolistic control over amateur radio in the United States, in the
> name of "amateur radio". And the FCC, taking the word of the ARRL as
> gospel, is ruining the hobby in the process. Been on 20 meters lately?
>
> Everything has been done in the name of making things "easy". Let's make it
> easy for people to get their amateur ticket. That way we'll increase our
> ranks (not to mention the number of ads the equipment manufacturers will
> run in QST to advertise to all those new hams). Yesiree, that's the ticket.
> Ooops, pardon the pun.

This has come about only because the amateur community does not want to put forth the effort to write Washington about their views, and want someone else to do it for them. We as amateurs are to blame for this. We must let those who think they know best for us that they are crazy and get out of our lives.

> (Yet More Stuff Deleted)
>
> The cancer is spreading, and chemotherapy is needed.

Perhaps, but self-treatment is needed. Many of the complaints about code are based on the fact that novices and no-code techs have no dx voice privileges, with the exception of the often closed 6 meter band. To give them a taste of dx and an incentive to upgrade, I think that they should be allowed some limited voice on 10 meters. This should encourage them to learn the code if they can or want to.

> >While I don't necessarily support the abolition of 13 & 20 WPM test, I
> >do think that access to the voice portions should not be dependent upon
> >morse code speed. Make it so if you want to access the lower ends of the
> >CW band, you have to pass the 13 and 20WPM tests.

(see previous response)

```
> And isn't that part of the proposal you're working on? Of course, Dana
> "No I don't paint everyone with a single brush like the SBS-BS crowd do"
> would have everyone here believe that its simply a proposal to repeal the
> no-code license.
```

>

 γ

> Another flash of brilliance brought to you by:

> MD

I will not presume of myself as MD did, but merely state that these are my opinions. I welcome any comments and/or constructive criticisms.

73 's

--

| | | |
|--------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| Michael Fortner | * | "I've got all this love to give and |
| N0??? | * | so far all I have is my ham radio" |
| ncc2001@cwis.unomaha.edu | * | -Selma Bouvier |

Date: Mon, 12 Jul 1993 16:55:28 GMT

From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!

squam.banyan.com!banyan.com!dts@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: Give a VE \$5.60, walk

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

The short answer is that the code tests are a government approved form of Hazing. This from a government that outlawed hazing...

— —

Daniel Senie
Banyan Systems, Inc.

Internet: dts@questar.banyan.com
Compuserve: 74176,1347

508-898-1188

Packet Radio: N1JEB@KA1SRD.MA

Date: 12 Jul 1993 13:03:40 GMT

From: pipex!uknet!warwick!kinguni!vulture!ap_v132@uunet.uu.net

Subject: Give a VE \$5.60, walk out with a ham license...

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Tony Pelliccio (system@garlic.sbs.com) wrote:

: partos@larry.larc.nasa.gov (Dick Partos) writes:

: > I don't see your problem with assigning a temporary call to someone
: > who's successfully passed all requirements for a license. Why force
: > someone to wait 8-10 weeks just for the paperwork to slog its way
: > through the bureocracy? Is this just another example of "I had to do
: > it, so you do too"?

: No, but it opens up a Pandora's Box of abuses.

--

Here in the UK anyone who has passed their examination (and not yet got their ticket) can use the station and call-sign of another licenced amateur until such time as their own licence comes through. In my opinion this is a good approach because it means a person who has just passed their test can get a "look in" while at the same time being suitably supervised (a requirement) by the amateur whose call they are using.

Do you not have a system like that in other areas? It seems like too good an idea not to have been exported.

-Niall

(Who has just taken his exam and not yet got his licence and so knows how it feels!)

Niall Pagdin, Student Advisory (SC), Kingston University,
Kingston-upon-Thames, London, England.

E-Mail: niall@atlas.king.ac.uk

"Paranoia is not a disease - its a way of life!"

Date: Mon, 12 Jul 1993 16:31:57 GMT

From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!

Csli!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: Give a VE \$5.60, walk out with a ham license...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In <21rnfc\$6mg@mercury.king.ac.uk> ap_v132@king.ac.uk (Niall Pagdin) writes:

>Here in the UK anyone who has passed their examination (and not yet got
>their ticket) can use the station and call-sign of another licenced
>amateur until such time as their own licence comes through. In my
>opinion this is a good approach because it means a person who has just passed
>their test can get a "look in" while at the same time being suitably
>supervised (a requirement) by the amateur whose call they are using.

This is a REALLY outstanding idea. I guess the way you could make it work here would be to add an extra slot on the 610 and the CSCE for an Elmer's callsign and signature. This would encourage interaction between new and old hams, solving many problems at once.

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, _A Nation of Victims_

Date: Mon, 12 Jul 1993 13:30:09 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!rsg1.er.usgs.gov!
dgg.cr.usgs.gov!bodoh@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul08.171208.129874@locus.com>,
<930709.232727.5Q0.rusnews.w165w@hades.cdp.org>, <129asa912an@vatican.cdp.org>J
Subject : Re: Dana's generalizations (was Re: Lost petition for VHF/UHF beams)

In article <129asa912an@vatican.cdp.org>, mike@vatican.cdp.org (Reverend Mike) writes:

|>
|> I see the same thing happening to amateur radio. Slowly, its been turned
|> into another 11 meters.
|>...
|> Next we were blessed with the wonderful no-code license. In *THIS* area
|> (see if you can understand that, Dana) I would say that 90% of the no-codes
|> are CB-transplants. 10-4. I'll be on the side. You have yourself a super-fine
|> one. I gotta back on outta here. Basically, they became hams because when
|> they unkeyed their mobile CB radio, it didn't go "bleep". Of course, there are
|> some really good no-codes. However, most of them already upgraded.
|>...

--

I would like to interject something here... I would be willing to bet that most hams that have gotten their tickets since about 1975 or so started out as CB'ers. Additionally, I would bet that many that were hams prior to 1975 dabbled in CB either when it first came out or when it peaked in the early 1970's. I recently passed my no-code and am working on my General - I have been a radio/electronics enthusiast for about 25 years and have dabbled in shortwave, scanners and CB's. I do not think my background is unique.

Yes, the tests are easy. Yes, the FCC is unable/unwilling to enforce, based on priorities and budget cuts. The ARRL seems willing to take up as much slack as they can - someone has to, and after the FCC they would seem to be the most likely candidate. You are going to see this happen more and more as budgets are further cut.

How about some ideas for improving things;

- o Allow the FCC to charge for CB and ham licenses again. Some may have problems with this, but if we expect enforcement, we need to fund them.
- o Push for more funding for the FCC.
- o Push for better collection of fines. I'm not sure what kind of punch the FCC has - but perhaps they could use better support from other agencies in collecting fines and tracking down people.
- o Offload mundane stuff to the VEC's - such as data entry of license applications/upgrades. The VEC would handle data entry and would send batches of electronic data to the FCC. Let the FCC handle the enforcement, not the paperwork. We would also have to raise the testing fee to cover costs.
- o Organize and train groups of hams around the country to handle the initial identification of violators. I know that hams already notify the FCC, but this needs to be formalized and training provided in order to stay legal and be helpful to the FCC. The FCC would have to agree to act on those professional tips but would obviously need more funding.
- o Require that in order to purchase ham radio transmitters, you must provide a callsign that is current. If buying for someone else, you would provide their callsign. I'd hate to slam the door on prospective hams that buy their HT while studying for their test (as I did) but it may need to be done.

I'm sure that there are shortfalls to all of these, but we must be practical and realize that the FCC has it's hands tied (or amputated) by budget cuts

and prioritization. We - as hams - must admit that we might have to pay more (in license fees, etc) in order to get the enforcement we expect...

++++++
+ Tom Bodoh - Sr. systems software engineer, Hughes STX, NOX?? (in the mail) +
+ USGS/EROS Data Center, Sioux Falls, SD, USA 57198 (605) 594-6830 +
+ Internet; bodoh@dgg.cr.usgs.gov (152.61.192.66)

+
+ "Welcome back my friends to the show that never ends!" EL&P
+

++++++

Date: 12 Jul 1993 14:30:14 GMT
From: topaz.bds.com!topaz.bds.com!ron@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <21pgi2INNaua@emx.cc.utexas.edu>,
<1993Jul11.212512.24067@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>, <!gtx17@dixie.com>

Subject : Re: Brilliant postings

When I tune across the dial I hear maybe a couple hundred machine-generated CW conversations going on.

OK, John, how do you determine whether the CW is machine generated? A good iambic keyer in competent hands will sound identical to the ideal weighting.

-Ron

Date: Mon, 12 Jul 1993 13:08:56 GMT
From: swrinde!gatech!hubcap!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <930709.232727.5Q0.rusnews.w165w@hades.cdp.org>,
<1993Jul10.164903.15522@ke4zv.uucp>,
<930711.133241.4w6.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: Coots at SBS (was Re: Lost petition for VHF/UHF beams)

In article <930711.133241.4w6.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com> system@garlic.sbs.com (Tony Pelliccio) writes:

>gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman) writes:

>

>> Think about this for a moment Tony. To use the CW portions of the

>> band, an amateur has to be proficient in Morse. Without proficiency,
>> those band segments are useless to the amateur. Therefore testing
>> is irrelevant, either they can do it and do, or they can't, and don't.
>> The Morse test is just a silly formalism with no functional effect
>> in this context.

>

>Ever listen in on those parts of the band? There're all sorts of code
>speeds, between 10 and 30WPM. I don't call it a silly formalism since if
>you took away the restrictions, you'd have the 5WPM people all over the
>place and there'd be no INCENTIVE to increase code speed. What you're
>essentially proposing is to eliminate incentive licensing, a bad idea at
>it's best.

I agree wholeheartedly that Incentive Licensing was a bad idea at best.
I'd go further and say it's been a disaster for US amateur radio that's
only recently been partially corrected. You complain that there are those
operating at 10 to 30 WPM in the Extra portion, but these are the people
who went through the "silly formalism". It doesn't seem to have set a
minimum speed limit after all. As far as I'm concerned, the only incentive
to increase code speed is to avoid growing old and grey trying to complete
a contact. That's sufficient incentive. If you don't want to deal with
slow operators, don't answer their calls.

Gary

--

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--------------|--|--------------------------|
| Gary Coffman KE4ZV | | You make it, | | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary |
| Destructive Testing Systems | | we break it. | | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary |
| 534 Shannon Way | | Guaranteed! | | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary |
| Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | | | | |

Date: Mon, 12 Jul 93 14:37:15 GMT
From: walter!porthos!dancer!whs70@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul05.195330.26682@anomaly.sbs.com>,
<PARTOS.93Jul7222152@larry.larc.nasa.gov>,
<930709.144906.6y5.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com>
Subject : Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk out with a ham license...

In article <930709.144906.6y5.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com> system@garlic.sbs.com
(Tony Pelliccio) writes:

>partos@larry.larc.nasa.gov (Dick Partos) writes:

>> I don't see your problem with assigning a temporary call to someone
>> who's successfully passed all requirements for a license. Why force
>> someone to wait 8-10 weeks just for the paperwork to slog its way
>> through the bureocracy? Is this just another example of "I had to do

>> it, so you do too"?
>
>No, but it opens up a Pandora's Box of abuses.
> Tony Pelliccio kd1nr/ae

How about providing a list of those abuses so we can
rationally discuss them.

Before you do however, please don't waste time including
something along the lines of: "It will create more
opportunity for fraudulent calling with made up callsigns."

The reason I claim that is nonsense is because that possibility
exists today (e.g. what's to stop an unlicensed person from
just making up a valid sounding callsign? Answer - Nothing)

Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)
Morristown, NJ email via UUCP bcr!cc!whs70
201-829-2879 Weekdays email via Internet whs70@cc.bellcore.com

Date: Mon, 12 Jul 93 17:12:13 GMT
From: walter!porthos!dancer!whs70@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <930709.232727.5Q0.rusnews.w165w@hades.cdp.org>,
<129asa912an@vatican.cdp.org>, <1993Jul12.133009.17139@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>
Subject : Re: Dana's generalizations (was Re: Lost petition for VHF/UHF beams)

In article <1993Jul12.133009.17139@rsg1.er.usgs.gov> bodoh@dggs.cr.usgs.gov (Tom
Bodoh) writes:

commentary by another poster on CBers now hams deleted.....

>--
>I would like to interject something here... I would be willing to bet that
>most hams that have gotten their tickets since about 1975 or so started out
>as CB'ers. Additionally, I would bet that many that were hams prior to
>1975 dabbled in CB either when it first came out or when it peaked in the
>early 1970's. I recently passed my no-code and am working on my General - I
>have been a radio/electronics enthusiast for about 25 years and have dabbled
>in shortwave, scanners and CB's. I do not think my background is unique.

>
>Yes, the tests are easy. Yes, the FCC is unable/unwilling to enforce, based
>on priorities and budget cuts. The ARRL seems willing to take up as much
>slack as they can - someone has to, and after the FCC they would seem to be
>the most likely candidate. You are going to see this happen more and more
>as budgets are further cut.

>

>How about some ideas for improving things;

>

- > o Allow the FCC to charge for CB and ham licenses again. Some may
- > have problems with this, but if we expect enforcement, we need to
- > fund them.

I have no problem with a nominal fee for my ham license. As to CBers, the FCC has not issued CB licenses for years and isn't likely to ever do so again.

- > o Push for more funding for the FCC.

Sounds OK to me.

- > o Push for better collection of fines. I'm not sure what kind of
- > punch the FCC has - but perhaps they could use better support from
- > other agencies in collecting fines and tracking down people.

Not much in the way of BIG \$\$\$ in that except as a possible deterrent. On that basis alone it is worth seeing bigger fines being levied.

- > o Offload mundane stuff to the VEC's - such as data entry of license
- > applications/upgrades. The VEC would handle data entry and would
- > send batches of electronic data to the FCC. Let the FCC handle the
- > enforcement, not the paperwork. We would also have to raise the
- > testing fee to cover costs.

Over time that is going to happen (IMHO).

- > o Organize and train groups of hams around the country to handle the
- > initial identification of violators. I know that hams already
- > notify the FCC, but this needs to be formalized and training
- > provided in order to stay legal and be helpful to the FCC. The
- > FCC would have to agree to act on those professional tips but
- > would obviously need more funding.

That's already happening through the OO (official Observer) system. The first line of defense has always been self-policing of the ham bands.

- > o Require that in order to purchase ham radio transmitters, you must
- > provide a callsign that is current. If buying for someone else,
- > you would provide their callsign. I'd hate to slam the door on
- > prospective hams that buy their HT while studying for their test
- > (as I did) but it may need to be done.

Waste of time and unenforceable. That always looks good on paper, but those that really want such equipment can always get it anyway (hamfests, through the mail, etc.) Even as you point out, the bigger negative is

the lost potential of ham "wanna-bees" who might rather buy a transciever (either HF or VHF) while waiting to get their "ticket."

>I'm sure that there are shortfalls to all of these, but we must be practical
>and realiize that the FCC has it's hands tied (or amputated) by budget cuts
>and prioritization. We - as hams - must admit that we might have to pay more
>(in license fees, etc) in order to get the enforcement we expect...
>+ Tom Bodoh - Sr. systems software engineer, Hughes STX, N0X?? (in the mail) +

At least you are offering suggestions. Do get involved and do become the Best Example of a ham you can be. That'll do more for the hobby than almost anything else.

Good luck and we look forward to your getting on the air when your ticket arrives.

73

Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)
Morristown, NJ email via UUCP bcr!cc!whs70
201-829-2879 Weekdays email via Internet whs70@cc.bellcore.com

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #223
